

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ROCK HILL DIVISION

Adrian T. Eaglin,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Civil Action No.: 0:14-cv-04003-TLW-PJG
	)	
Larry Cartledge, <i>Warden</i> ; Florence	)	
Mauney, <i>Ass. Warden</i> ; Curtis Early;	)	
Richard Turnner; Williams, <i>Captain</i> ;	)	
Vernon Miller, <i>Captain</i> ; Susan Duffy,	)	
<i>Captain</i> ; Springs, <i>Captain</i> ;	)	
Kevin Horn, <i>Lieutenant</i> ; Wessinger,	)	<b>ORDER</b>
<i>Lieutenant</i> ; Thurber, <i>Sergeant</i> ; Daniel	)	
Cotter, <i>Sergeant</i> ; Palmer, <i>Sergeant</i> ;	)	
Blackburn, <i>Sergeant</i> ; McCall, <i>Sergeant</i> ;	)	
Ragland, <i>Sergeant</i> ; Valero, <i>Sergeant</i> ;	)	
Christopher T. Dillard, <i>c/o</i> ;	)	
Gardner, #053548, <i>c/o</i> ; N. Morgan,	)	
<i>c/o</i> ; Boatwrite, <i>c/o</i> ; R. Martin,	)	
#053630, <i>c/o</i> ; Luvett, <i>c/o</i> ; Brown, <i>c/o</i> ;	)	
Merck, <i>c/o</i> ; Hagan, <i>Investigator</i> ;	)	
C. Hindenburg, II, <i>G.C.</i> ; Nancy	)	
Murchant, <i>Mail Clerk</i> ; Tamara Conwell,	)	
<i>Mail Clerk</i> ; Benjamin Lewis, <i>Doctor</i> ;	)	
Ame Enloe, <i>Nurse Practitioner</i> ; Mathew L.	)	
Harper, <i>Nurse Administrator</i> ; Katherine W.	)	
Burgess, <i>Nurse</i> ; Lindsey Harris, <i>Nurse</i> ;	)	
Dawn R. Chase, <i>Nurse</i> ; Fish, <i>Sergeant</i> ;	)	
Bryant Sterling, <i>Director</i> ; Bryan	)	
Degeogis; Cashwell, <i>Lieutenant</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

Plaintiff, Adrian T. Eaglin (“Plaintiff”), filed this pro se civil action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on or about October 15, 2014 alleging violations of his constitutional rights. (Doc. #1). Plaintiff filed an Amended Complaint on November 20, 2014.<sup>1</sup> (Doc. #16).

---

<sup>1</sup> A document is considered filed on the date it was properly delivered to prison officials for mailing to the court. Houston v. Lack, 487 U.S. 266 (1988).

This matter now comes before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) issued on September 17, 2015 by United States Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 (B)(2), DSC. (Doc. #116). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge addresses several motions filed by Plaintiff requesting a preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order. (Docs. #60, #83, #93, #110). Defendants filed responses opposing Plaintiff’s motions. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the District Court deny Plaintiff’s original motion for a preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order (Doc. #60), rendering the remaining motions (Docs. #83, #93, #110) moot. (See Doc #116). The Plaintiff did not file objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report. The deadline for the Plaintiff to file objections expired on October 5, 2015.<sup>2</sup> (See Doc. #116).

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

This Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation, the record in this case, and the relevant filings. Plaintiff failed to file objections to the Report. Accordingly, for the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. #116). Plaintiff’s motion for a preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order (Doc. #60) is hereby **DENIED**.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Report and Recommendation was mailed to Plaintiff at the mailing address the Plaintiff provided to the Court on September 17, 2015. (See Doc. #117). The mail was not returned.

Plaintiff's motions requesting a ruling on the motion for a preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order (Docs. #83, #93, #110) are hereby rendered moot; to the extent those filings could be construed as separate and independent motions by the Plaintiff seeking preliminary injunctive relief, those motions are denied. (Docs. #83, #93, #110).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Terry L. Wooten  
Terry L. Wooten  
Chief United States District Judge

December 3, 2015  
Columbia, South Carolina